INTRODUCTION

Report of the California Performance Review Commission to the Governor

On August 3, 2004, the California Performance Review (CPR) delivered their final recommendations to reform California state government to Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger. The guiding principals set forth by the CPR team as they formulated their recommendations were the following:

- · Put the people first;
- · Save taxpayers dollars;
- · Be visionary and innovative;
- · Be accountable and efficient; and
- · Be performance driven.

The 2,000 page report consisted of four volumes, made over 1,200 individual recommendations, and touched upon almost every aspect of state government operations.

As part of his process to decide which recommendations to pursue, Governor Schwarzenegger formed the CPR Commission, an independent and bi-partisan commission consisting of leaders in the public, private, and non-profit sectors. The charge of the CPR Commission was to gather public input, review, and ultimately report findings on the CPR recommendations to the Governor.

The Commission held eight hearings throughout California between August 13 and October 20, 2004. During those hearings, the Commission heard from over 100 subject matter experts in the fields of infrastructure, resources, health and human services, education, government operations, corrections, and government organization. In total, the Commission received both oral and written comments from over 3,600 members of the public at large regarding the CPR recommendations.

Per the Governor's directive, the Commission's mandate was to gather the breadth of thoughts and opinions on the recommendations from all stakeholders of California state government. The Commission heard from residents, business operators, students, health care professionals, firefighters, and other interested parties throughout the state. People representing all facets of California life were eager to not only listen to the issues as they were being presented, but also to voice their opinions and

otherwise participate in the hearing process. As a whole, the Commission believes that the major issues stemming from the CPR report have had an opportunity to be presented for consideration. This report summarizes the 3,600 testimonies gathered throughout the course of the public comment process.

APPROACH

The CPR Commission received public comments from four different sources between August 3, 2004 and September 30, 2004:

- **CPR Website and e-mail:** The CPR Commission received 1,700 submittals from the CPR website.
- Mail and fax: The CPR Commission received 1,200 submittals via mail and fax.
- Oral Testimony: The CPR Commission heard over 100 formal testimonies from subject matter experts during the course of the hearings.
- **Public Comment:** The CPR Commission heard from 600 members of the public during the public comment period of the hearings.

All testimony was weighted equally in the compilation of this report. Though the exact wording may differ from that of the original testimony received, the Commission staff has strived to articulate all substantive comments received without judgment or bias. Inasmuch, this report is not a representation of the opinions or thoughts of the Commission or the Commission staff. Also, it should be noted that neither the Commission nor the staff have validated the assertions made by the public.

For the purposes of this report, comments on the CPR issues and recommendations are presented in three sections:

- **Pros:** Public comments made in favor of a specific recommendation;
- Cons: Public comments made in opposition to a specific recommendation; and
- **Considerations:** Public comments made that are neither explicitly in favor nor in opposition to a recommendation, but identify issues that should be taken into account during the policy deliberation and design process or during the policy implementation phase.

The report also presents the number of public comments heard on each issue. In addition to the total number of comments received for a recommendation, the number of public comments supporting, opposing, and neutral has also been reported. Please note that unless comments explicitly noted support or opposition, the comment was classified under neutral. Also note that the counts should not be construed as an absolute indicator of the amount of public support either for or against any particular recommendations, but may be considered a surrogate indicator of the amount of interest in particular topics.

In many instances, individuals often commented on a number of recommendations. As such, the total number of comments will be greater than the number of individuals reported. The section above presents the 3,600 count as testimonies/comments, not as individuals. In addition, recommendations that did not receive any comments were not included in this report.